



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

JIMMY-JOE COOLEY,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 3:21-2739-MGL
GARY L. MARTIN, JR.,	§	
Defendant.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Jimmy-Joe Cooley (Cooley), proceeding pro se, filed this civil action against the Defendant Gary L. Martin, Jr. (Martin) in the Kershaw County Court of Common Pleas. Martin removed the case to this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Although Cooley's complaint fails to specifically identify a cause of action, the Court liberally construes the complaint to bring claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violation of his Fourth Amendment rights.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Martin's motion for summary judgment be granted. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on May 5, 2022. To date, neither party has filed any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Martin’s motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 1st day of June 2022, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.